arXiv:1508.05702v2 [math.NT] 27 Aug 2015

Asymptotic bases and probabilistic representation functions

Christian Táfula
Institute of Mathematics and Statistics
University of São Paulo, Brazil
Email: tafula@ime.usp.br

Abstract

Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we write $r_d(n;A)$ and $s_d(x;A)$ to refer to the number of solutions to $k_1 + k_2 + \ldots + k_d = n$ and $k_1 + k_2 + \ldots + k_d \leqslant x$ respec., where $d \geqslant 1$ is fixed and all $k_i \in A$. In this paper we study the asymptotic behaviour of $r_d(n;A)$ and $s_d(x;A)$ when $|A \cap [0,x]|$ can be estimated by O-regularly varying functions. We then give necessary and some sufficient conditions for A to form an asymptotic basis.

An asymptotic h-basis is often called *economic* when $r_h(n;B) \ll_\varepsilon n^\varepsilon$. In view of Erdös-Tetali theorem on economic bases, that ensures the existence of h-bases B with $r_h(n;B) \asymp \log(n)$, we describe a general method to study random sequences $\omega \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with a given asymptotic behaviour $|\omega \cap [0,x]| \sim f(x)$ for certain fs. An explanation of how $\log(n)$ appears as a natural limitation for standard probabilistic approaches to this problem is provided once we derive the existence of asymptotic h-bases satisfying $r_d(n;B) \asymp f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}$ for every $d \geqslant h$.

Finally, we present an elementary combinatorial heuristic approach that predicts, except for a constant, Hardy-Littlewood's extended Goldbach's conjecture.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Representation functions . . . 2
1.2 Asymptotic notation . . . 3
1.3 Sketch of the sections . . . 4

2 Asymptotic behaviour of asymptotic bases **5**
2.1 General approach . . . 5
2.2 Integral formula for s_d . . . 7
2.3 Sufficient conditions to form asymptotic bases . . . 8
2.4 Some limitations . . . 12

3 Probability measures on $\mathcal{S}$ **13**
3.1 Constructing $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ . . . 13
3.2 Integral formula for $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$ . . . 15
3.3 f-regular asymptotic bases . . . 18

4 Remarks on Goldbach's conjecture **22**
4.1 Setup and motivation . . . 23
4.2 The random variables $\tilde{g}(n)$ . . . 24
4.3 Asymptotic behaviour of $\tilde{g}(n)$ . . . 25

1 Introduction

In this paper we shall call $\mathcal{S}$ the set of subsequences of the sequence of nonnegative integers, i.e. the set of monotone strictly increasing nonnegative integer sequences, or

Definition 1.1 (Space of nonnegative integer sequences)**.**

$$\mathcal{S} := \{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0} : |A| = \aleph_0\}.$$

A central problem in additive number theory is to decide whether a subsequence of the sequence of nonnegative integers is a finite basis or asymptotic basis. We will describe some general methods that uses the asymptotic density of a sequence to decide this. All information will be derived in terms of the representation functions we are about to define.

1.1 Representation functions

Definition 1.2 (Representation functions)**.** Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \geqslant 2$ an integer. For every nonnegative integer n we define

- $r(n; A) = r_1(n; A) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \in A, \\ 0 & \text{if } n \notin A. \end{cases}$
- $r_d(n; A) := \displaystyle\sum_{k_1+k_2+\ldots+k_d=n} r(k_1; A)r(k_2; A)\ldots r(k_d; A)$

and, for every nonnegative real number x,

- $s(x; A) = s_1(x; A) := |A \cap [0, x]|$
- $s_d(x; A) := \displaystyle\sum_{n\leqslant x} r_d(n; A).$

That is, $r(n; A)$ works like a characteristic function of A in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, whereas $s(x; A)$ counts the number of elements of A up to x. Thus, $r_d(n; A)$ is the number of solutions to $k_1 + k_2 + \ldots + k_d = n$ with $k_j \in A$ considering permutations, and $s_d(x; A)$ the number of solutions to $k_1 + k_2 + \ldots + k_d \leqslant x$ with $k_j \in A$ also considering permutations. We may illustrate this via the formal series

$$\sum_{n\geqslant 0} r_d(n; A)z^n = \left(\sum_{k\in A} z^k\right)^d. \tag{1.1}$$

One, however, should not be bothered by the fact that our representation functions count repetitions. In fact, defining

$$r_d^*(n; A) := \left|\left\{\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_d\} \subseteq A : \sum_{j=1}^{n} k_j = n\right\}\right|$$

and $s_d^*(x; A) := \sum_{n\leqslant x} r_d^*(n; A)$, it is easily seen that $r_d^*(n; A) \asymp r_d(n; A)$ given that $r_d(n; A)/d! \leqslant r_d^*(n; A) \leqslant r_d(n; A)$. The same, consequently, holds for s_d and s_d^*, so results about growth orders can be easily translated from one definition to another. It is worth noting that we use a lot of asymptotic notation in this paper, all standard on literature.

The first interesting thing that can be said about our representation functions is that these are related by some recurrence relations.

Proposition 1.3 (Recursive formulas)**.** *Let* $A \in \mathcal{S}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ *and* $d \geqslant 2$*. Then for every* $1 \leqslant l < d$*:*

(i) $r_d(n; A) = \sum_{k \leqslant n} r_{d-l}(k; A) r_l(n-k; A)$

(ii) $s_d(n; A) = \sum_{k \leqslant n} r_{d-l}(k; A) s_l(n-k; A)$

(iii) $s_d(n; A) = \sum_{k \leqslant n} s_{d-l}(k; A) r_l(n-k; A)$.

Proof. The item (i) cames easily from the formal series (1.1). For (ii), by (i):

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n; A) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k} r_{d-l}(j; A) r_l(k-j; A) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{k=j}^{n} r_{d-l}(j; A) r_l(k-j; A) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} r_{d-l}(j; A) s_l(n-j; A). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for (iii):

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n; A) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k} r_{d-l}(k-j; A) r_l(j; A) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{k=j}^{n} r_{d-l}(k-j; A) r_l(j; A) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} s_{d-l}(j; A) r_l(n-j; A). \end{aligned}$$ ■

Usually when we cite these formulas we will be referring to the case $l = 1$. Note that these formulas explain in part why $r_d(n; A)$ is generally easier to deal rather than the version *without* repetitions. As an example, take $\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. It is easy to deduce that

$$r_d(n; \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}) = \binom{n+d-1}{d-1},$$

for $d \geqslant 2$, whereas the version *without* repetition is well-known to be more difficult to deal. We also have a naive way to convert information from s_d to r_d, namely

Definition 1.4 (Mean value of r_d)**.** Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \geqslant 1$ an integer. For every nonnegative real number x we define

$$\tilde{r}_d(x; A) := \frac{s_d(x; A)}{x}.$$

1.2 Asymptotic notation

Throughout this paper, our asymptotic notations will always refer to $x \to +\infty$ through the reals and $n \to +\infty$ through the integers, unless otherwise specified.

We say that a real function f is **asymptotically defined** when it is defined in $[\alpha, +\infty)$ for some $\alpha \geqslant 0$. Whenever we write an "α" that is not specified in the context, there will be one or more asymptotically defined functions within the context, and the "α" will be referring to the least $\alpha > 0$ such that all of those are well-defined.

We write $f \ll g$, $g \gg f$ or $f = O(g)$ when

$$\limsup_{x \to +\infty} \left| \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \right| < +\infty;$$

and $f \prec g$, $g \succ f$ or $f = o(g)$ when $\lim f(x)/g(x) = 0$. When these notation came with a subscript ε it means that the estimate is valid for all $\varepsilon > 0$. For example, $f(x) = O_\varepsilon(g(x,\varepsilon))$ means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ holds $\limsup_x |f(x)/g(x,\varepsilon)| < +\infty$.

When $f \ll g$ *and* $g \ll f$ we write $f \asymp g$ or $f = \Theta(g)$, that is equivalent to

$$\exists M > 0 : \forall x > M, \exists c_1, c_2 > 0 : c_1|g(x)| \leqslant |f(x)| \leqslant c_2|g(x)|;$$

and $f \sim g$ when $\lim f(x)/g(x) = 1$.

Let us now talk a bit about regularly varying functions. An extensive treatment of this kind of functions may be found in N. H. Bingham's et al. book *Regular Variation*. We state the next definition with Karamata's characterisation theorem in mind (for reference, see Theorem 1.4.1 from [2]).

Definition 1.5 (Regular variation)**.** Let f be an asymptotically defined positive real-valued measurable function. We say that f is:

$$\begin{aligned} &\textbf{Slowly varying}: && \forall\lambda > 0,\ f(\lambda x) \sim f(x);\\ &\textbf{Regularly varying}: && \exists\rho\in\mathbb{R} : \forall\lambda > 0,\ f(\lambda x) \sim \lambda^\rho f(x);\\ &O\textbf{-regularly varying}: && \forall\lambda > 0,\ f(\lambda x) \asymp f(x). \end{aligned}$$

The kind of functions that we will treat, however, are the following.

Definition 1.6 (Type-1 function)**.** A **type-**1 function is an asymptotically defined real-valued function f that is positive, monotonic and O-regularly varying.

Definition 1.7 (Type-2 function)**.** A **type-**2 function is an asymptotically defined real-valued differentiable function f that diverges, such that both f and f' are positive, monotonic and O-regularly varying, with f' being bounded.

We will need functions like this to deal with the kind of convolutions that will show up. The reader should no be bothered by these apparent *ad hoc* assumptions, for the majority of interesting cases are within the conditions we shall assume throughout this paper, like $x^\alpha \log(x)^\beta$ and iterated logs, for example.

Having done the setup, we now describe briefly the content of the paper.

1.3 Sketch of the sections

In *Section 2* we discuss general aspects of the growth of the representation functions, starting by showing that $s_d(x;A) \succ s_{d-1}(x;A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}$. We then describe an integral formula relating $s_d(x;A)$ to $s_{d-1}(x;A)$ when $s(x;A) \sim f(x)$ for some C^1 *type-*1 function. Later, we explore some ideas from L. G. Schnirelmann described by M. B. Nathanson in [10] to state sufficient conditions to ensure that a certain sequence $A \in \mathcal{S}$ forms an asymptotic basis. We finish by remarking on some limitations of our methods via counterexamples.

In *Section 3* we explore a commonly used probabilistic construction that assigns a probability to decide whether a sequence contains or not a certain $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ by taking $r(n,\omega)$ to behave as a Bernoulli trial. Then, with all our representation functions behaving as random variables, we study the structure of this space related to these r.v.s, specifically the asymptotic behaviour a.s. of s_d and of the expected value of r_d, both in terms of *type*-1 and *type*-2 functions f. The setup of the work of P. Erdös and P. Tetali in [5] is included within the case when $f(x) = x^{1/d}\log(x)^{1/d}$.

Still on *Section 3*, our results lead to the concept of f-regular and $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic bases. We reinterpret Erdös-Tetali theorem and the P. Erdös' "strong Erdös-Turán" conjecture (which was first presented in [4]) in terms of $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic bases, remarking the motivation of these by the technical limitations of the "exponential bounds and Borel-Cantelli's lemma" approach to the economic bases problem.

Finally, on *Section 4* we present an elementary combinatorial heuristic argument that motivates a conjecture almost as strong as Hardy-Littlewood's extended Goldbach's conjecture. The probabilistic construction to be used there will be substantially different from the one we shall describe in Section 3. We use, basically, calculus, the PNT, estimates of Euler's totient function φ and the distinct prime divisors counting function ω, a exponential bound for the hypergeometric probability distribution and Borel-Cantelli's lemma. As one should expect, we do not deduce *exactly* Hardy-Littlewood's extended Goldbach's conjecture, but with considerably fewer methods we managed to miss it only by a constant!

2 Asymptotic behaviour of asymptotic bases

Our main results are Theorems 2.5, 2.6 and Corollary 2.11.

2.1 General approach

With the recurrence formulas in Proposition 1.3 we can start to relate the growth of the s_d function for $d \geqslant 2$ with the growth of $s(x; A)$ for a fixed $A \in \mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$. For every $d \geqslant 1$,

$$s(x/2; A)^d \leqslant s_d(x; A) \leqslant s(x; A)^d.$$

Proof. It obviously holds for $d = 1$, so we proceed by induction. We have

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n; A) &= \sum_{k \leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k; A) r(n-k; A) \\ &\leqslant s_{d-1}(n; A) \sum_{k \leqslant n} r(n-k; A) \\ &= s_{d-1}(n; A) s(n; A) \leqslant s(n; A)^d, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n; A) &\geqslant \sum_{n/2 \leqslant k \leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k; A) r(n-k; A) \\ &\geqslant s_{d-1}(n/2; A) \sum_{n/2 \leqslant k \leqslant n} r(n-k; A) \\ &= s_{d-1}(n/2; A) s(n/2; A) \geqslant s(n/2; A)^d, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

as required. ■

Note that this result implies that $s_d(x;A) \asymp s(x;A)^d$ when $s(x;A)$ is O-regularly varying. Actually, we can state this in a quite more general form:

Theorem 2.2. Let f be O-regularly varying and $A \in \mathcal{S}$ a sequence. Thus,

$$\text{If } s(x;A) \ \Box\ f(x), \text{ then } s_d(x;A) \ \Box\ f(x)^d,$$

where "$\Box$" can be any of the asymptotic signs $\asymp, \gg, \ll, \succ, \prec$.

Proof. Follows immediately by Lemma 2.1. ∎

in order to a given sequence $A \in \mathcal{S}$ be an asymptotic basis, a necessary condition is to have $\tilde{r}_d(x;A) \gg 1$ for some $d \geqslant 1$, otherwise $r_d(n;A)$ will certainly be 0 for infinite values of n. Put differently, we deduce from these considerations that

Corollary 2.3. If $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is an asymptotic basis, then $s(x;A) \gg x^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Otherwise, by Theorem 2.2, we would have $s_d(x;A) \ll_\varepsilon x^\varepsilon$ for every $d \geqslant 1$, that inhibits $r_d(n;A)$ from being > 0 for all sufficiently large n. ∎

We will describe now, however, a result that holds in general, but first we need another lemma.

Lemma 2.4. Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ be a sequence. If L is an asymptotically defined positive non-decreasing function such that $L(x) \prec s(x;A)$, then, for every integer $d \geqslant 1$,

$$s_d(x;A) \sim s_d(x - L(x);A).$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on d. When $d = 1$, taking sufficiently large x:

$$s(x;A) = \sum_{n \leqslant x} r(n;A) \leqslant \sum_{n \leqslant x - L(x)} r(n;A) + L(x) = s(x - L(x);A) + L(x)$$

So $s(x;A) \sim s(x - L(x);A)$. Assuming now that $s_{d-1}(x;A) \sim s_{d-1}(x - L(x);A)$, follows, taking sufficiently large n,

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n;A) &= \sum_{k \leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k;A) r(n-k;A) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{L(n) \leqslant k \leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k;A) r(n-k;A)}_{\gamma_1(n)} + \underbrace{\sum_{k < L(n)} s_{d-1}(k;A) r(n-k;A)}_{\gamma_2(n)} \end{aligned}$$

Now, observing each term separately, we have

$$\gamma_1(n) \gg s(n - L(n);A) s_{d-1}(L(n);A) \sim s(n;A) s_{d-1}(L(n);A)$$

and

$$\gamma_2(n) \ll \big(s(n;A) - s(n - L(n);A)\big) s_{d-1}(L(n);A) \prec s(n;A) s_{d-1}(L(n);A),$$

thus $\gamma_1(n) \succ \gamma_2(n)$. We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n;A) &\sim \sum_{L(n)\leqslant k\leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k;A)r(n-k;A) \\ &\sim \sum_{L(n)\leqslant k\leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k-L(n);A)r(n-k;A) \\ &= \sum_{k\leqslant n-\lceil L(n)\rceil} s_{d-1}(k;A)r(n-k-\lceil L(n)\rceil;A) = s_d(n-\lceil L(n)\rceil;A). \end{aligned}$$

Given that s_d and L are non-decreasing, we conclude $s_d(x;A) \sim s_d(x-L(x);A)$. ■

Theorem 2.5. If $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is an arbitrary sequence, then $s_d(x;A) \succ s_{d-1}(x;A)$ for every integer $d \geqslant 2$.

Proof. Take a real-valued function L satisfying the hypotheses from Lemma 2.4 such that $L(x) \succ 1$. Such a function, in fact, exists. We can take, for example, for some $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$L(x) := s(x;A)^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Cleary, such $L(x)$ satisfies $1 \prec L(x) \prec s(x;A)$. Now proceeding we have, from Lemma 2.4, for every integer $d \geqslant 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n;A) &= \sum_{k\leqslant n} s_{d-1}(k;A)r(n-k;A) \\ &\geqslant \sum_{k\leqslant L(n)} s_{d-1}(n-k;A)r(k;A) \\ &\geqslant s_{d-1}(n-L(n);A)s(L(n);A) \gg s_{d-1}(n;A)s(L(n);A) \end{aligned}$$

Given that both $s(x;A)$ and $L(x)$ diverges, we have $s(L(x);A) \succ 1$. Hence, we deduce $s_d(x;A) \gg_\varepsilon s_{d-1}(x;A)s(s(x;A)^{1-\varepsilon};A)$, and *a fortiori*, $s_d(x;A) \succ s_{d-1}(x;A)$, as required. ■

We have just proved that $\tilde{r}_d(x;A) \succ \tilde{r}_{d-1}(x;A)$ for arbitrary sequences A. In plain English, the growth order of the average number of ways to write N as the sum of d elements of **any** given sequence is "bigger" than the growth order of the average number of ways to write N as the sum of $d-1$ elements of the same sequence.

2.2 Integral formula for s_d

Based on Theorem 2.2, we now study the case when the asymptotic sign is "$\sim$", that is a bit more delicate than the others. For the sake of generality, we shall consider an error term $O(\epsilon(x))$ on the approximation of $s(x;A)$ by some function f.

Theorem 2.6 (Integral formula for s_d)**.** *If $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is such that $s(x;A) = f(x) + O(\epsilon(x))$, with f being C^1 and $\epsilon(x) = o(f(x))$, both* type-1, *then for every integer $d \geqslant 1$ holds*

$$s_d(x;A) = \int_\alpha^{x-\alpha} s_{d-1}(t;A)f'(x-t)dt + O(f(x)^{d-1}\epsilon(x)).$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, consider the following:

$$\sum_{k\leqslant\alpha} r_{d-1}(k;A)s(n-k;A)\leqslant s_{d-1}(\alpha;A)s(n;A)\ll f(n), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\sum_{n-\alpha<k\leqslant n} r_{d-1}(k;A)s(n-k;A)\leqslant s_{d-1}(n;A)s(\alpha;A)\ll f(n)^{d-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

Then, by the recursive formulas, one can deduce*

$$s_d(n;A)=\sum_{k\leqslant n} r_{d-1}(k;A)s(n-k;A)=\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} r_{d-1}(k;A)f(n-k)+O(f(n)^{d-1}\epsilon(n))$$

Now we apply Abel's summation formula:

$$\begin{aligned} s_d(n;A) &= [s_{d-1}(t;A)f(n-t)]_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha}+\int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} s_{d-1}(t;A)f'(n-t)dt+O(f(n)^{d-1}\epsilon(n)) \\ &= \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} s_{d-1}(t;A)f'(n-t)dt+O(f(n)^{d-1}\epsilon(n)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

By Theorem 2.2 we already have $s_d(x;A)\asymp f(x)^d$, that is $\succ f(n)^{d-1}\epsilon(n)$. Thus, considering that $s_d(x;A)=s_d(\lfloor x\rfloor;A)$, we deduce from (2.4):

$$s_d(x;A)=\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} s_{d-1}(t;A)f'(x-t)dt+O(f(n)^{d-1}\epsilon(n)). \qquad \blacksquare$$

Comparing to the recurrence formulas on Proposition 1.3, this theorem is saying that, asymptotically, $r(n;A)$ behaves, in some way, very like to $f'(n)$. This intuition shall be strongly used in Section 3. Anyway, one might have expected to get

$$s_d(x;A)\sim C_{f,d}f(x)^d \tag{2.5}$$

for some constant depending on f and d. This, however, depends whether or not

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty}\frac{\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} f(t)^{m-1}f'(x-t)dt}{f(x)^m} \tag{2.6}$$

exists for integers $1\leqslant m\leqslant d$. If so, then $C_{f,d}=\prod_{m=1}^{d} c_{f,m}$, where $c_{f,m}$ are the limits (2.6).

One can show, for example, that if Q is the sequence of perfect squares, then holds $s_2(x;Q)\sim\frac{\pi}{4}x$; or if $\mathbb{P}$ is the sequence of prime numbers, then $s_2(x;\mathbb{P})\sim\frac{1}{2}\,x^2/(\log x)^2$. However, I could not decide a general condition over f that ensures that the above limit converges. Perhaps regularly varying *type*-1 functions satisfy this.

2.3 Sufficient conditions to form asymptotic bases

A way to approach this topic is by studying the *Schnirelmann density* of sequences. However, some sequences does not have $0,1$ as elements of it, or are not well distributed over the residue classes of some integers (e.g. the sequence of even numbers). We shall give some definitions to ensure the generality of the results of this subsection.

---

*When $\epsilon(x)$ is decreasing, the last step can be done splitting the sum into $k\leqslant n/2$ and $k>n/2$, similarly to (2.1).

Definition 2.7 (Degenerate sequences)**.** Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ be a sequence. Thus we define

$$\gcd(A) := \min_{a,b \in A} \gcd(a,b).$$

When $\gcd(A) > 1$, we say that A is a **degenerate sequence** and its **nondegenerate associated sequence** is given by $A^* := \{a/\gcd(A) : a \in A\}$. If $A \neq A^*$ and A^* is an asymptotic basis, then we say that A is a **degenerate asymptotic basis**.

This notion of degenerate sequence prevents us from discarding some sequences from our study, as the sequence of even numbers, for example. Nevertheless, it does not say anything about sequences like the sequence of odd numbers, so one can be interested in to write a sharper definition of *degeneracy*. Anyway, this definition will be sufficient to supply our necessities for now.

One can see that degenerate asymptotic bases are precisely those sequences such that there is an infinite arithmetic progression where any element of it can be written as the sum of a fixed number of elements of the sequence. In fact, if A is a degenerate asymptotic basis such that every $n \geqslant n_0$ can be written as the sum of h elements of its nondegenerate associated sequence A^*, then every number on the arithmetic progression $\{\gcd(A)n_0 + \gcd(A)k : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\}$ can be written as the sum of h elements of A.

The notations

$$A + B := \{a + b \ : \ a \in A, b \in B\},$$

$$dA := \underbrace{A + A + \ldots + A}_{d \text{ times}} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0} \ : \ r_d(n; A) > 0\},$$

for $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \geqslant 1$ are very common in literature, and will be useful on the proof of our next result. Firstly, let us state *Schnirelmann's Theorem* on arbitrary sequences containing $0, 1$.

Theorem (Schnirelmann)**.** *Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$ be a sequence such that $0 \in A$. The* Schnirelmann's density *of A is given by:*

$$\sigma(A) := \inf_{n=1,2,3\ldots} \frac{s(n; A)}{n}.$$

If $\sigma(A) > 0$, then A is a finite basis.

A proof of this theorem may be found in [7] and [10]. Using this theorem, L. G. Schnirelmann was able to prove that every number greater than or equal 2 can be written as the sum of a bounded number of primes. Following his line, we are interested in to give sufficient conditions to assure that every sufficiently large number can be written as the sum of a bounded number of elements from a given sequence. We start by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *If $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is a nondegenerate sequence with $\tilde{r}(x; A) \gg 1$, then $A \cup \{0\}$ is an asymptotic basis. That is, every sufficiently large integer is a sum of a bounded number of elements of A.*

Proof. Firstly, $\tilde{r}(x; A) \gg 1$ implies that

$$\liminf_{x \to +\infty} \frac{s(x; A)}{x} > 0.$$

Thus we have $\sigma(A \cup \{0,1\}) > 0$, so, by Schirelmann's theorem, $A \cup \{0,1\}$ is a finite basis of order, let's say, h_1.

Now, A is nondegenerate, so let $a, b \in A$ with $\gcd(a,b) = 1$. Given that the set $b, 2b, \ldots, ab \pmod{a}$ forms a covering system, we deduce that every integer $n \geqslant ab$ can be written in the form $n = l_1(n)a + l_2(n)b$, where $l_1(n), l_2(n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ with $l_2(n) < a$. Let

$$h_2 := \max_{ab \leqslant n \leqslant ab + h_1} (l_1(n) + l_2(n))$$

If $N > ab$, then $N - ab$ can be written as the sum of at most h_1 elements of $A \cup \{1\}$, that is, there are $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that

$$N - ab = \underbrace{1 + 1 + \ldots + 1}_{k} + a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_l,$$

where $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_l \in A$ and $k + l \leqslant h_1$. Hence:

$$N = l_1(ab+k)a + l_2(ab+k)b + a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_l.$$

That is, given that $k, l \leqslant h_1$, we can write N as the sum of

$$l + l_1(ab+k) + l_2(ab+k) \leqslant h_1 + h_2$$

elements of A, a fixed number. This completes the proof. ∎

Proposition 2.9. *If $A \in \mathcal{S}$ is a nondegenerate sequence such that $\tilde{r}(x; dA) \gg 1$ for some $d \geqslant 1$, then $A \cup \{0\}$ is an asymptotic basis.*

Proof. If dA is nondegenerate, then by the previous result the proof is complete, since $dA \cup \{0\} \subseteq d\,(A \cup \{0\})$.

Suppose then that dA is a degenerate sequence. Let's consider its *nondegenerate associated sequence* $(dA)^*$. It is immediately apparent that $s(x; (dA)^*) \geqslant s(x; dA)$ for every $x \geqslant 0$, therefore $\tilde{r}(x; (dA)^*) \gg 1$ and, by Lemma 2.8, dA is a degenerate asymptotic basis, let's say, of order h. As we previously discussed, there will be an infinite arithmetic progression of common difference $r := \gcd(dA)$ in the sequence hdA, let us say

$$P := \{n_0 + kr : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\}.$$

Now let us divide the problem into two cases:

Case 1.

If there is an element $a \in A$ such that $\gcd(a, r) = 1$, then given that the set $a, 2a, \ldots, ra \pmod{r}$ forms a covering system, we deduce that every integer $n \geqslant n_0 + ar$ can be written in the form $n = t + ak$, where $t \in P$ and $k < r$ is a nonnegative integer. That is to say, every sufficiently large integer can be written as the sum of at most $hd + r$ elements of A, so this case is done.

Case 2.

If there is no such element in A, given that A is nondegenerate, take $a, b \in A$ such that $\gcd(a,b) = 1$. The set $b, 2b, \ldots, ab \pmod{a}$ forms a covering system, so every integer $n \geqslant ab$ can be written in the form $n = l_1(n)a + l_2(n)b$, where $l_1(n), l_2(n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ with $l_2(n) < a$. A fortiori, there is a sufficiently large integer c coprime with r that can be written in the form $c = j_1 a + j_2 b$, for some nonnegative integers j_1, j_2.

Setting $j := j_1 + j_2$, we see that $c \in jA$, so, by a similar argument to the one in the previous case, every sufficiently large integer can be written as the sum of at most $hd + jr$ elements of A. This completes the proof. ∎

The next theorem and corollary captures a very important idea: in order to a given sequence be an asymptotic basis, not only the average value of r_d must be big, but the "variance" of r_d around the mean can't be too high.

Theorem 2.10. *Let* $A \in \mathcal{S}$ *be a nondegenerate sequence such that* $s(x;A) \gg x^{\varepsilon}$ *for some* $\epsilon > 0$. *If, for some integer* $d \geqslant 1/\varepsilon$ *holds*

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)^2 \ll \frac{s_d(x;A)^2}{x},$$

then $A \cup \{0\}$ *is an asymptotic basis.*

Proof. The first condition is a necessary condition by Corollary 2.3. We take $d \geqslant 1/\varepsilon$, thus $\tilde{r}_d(x;A) \gg 1$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left(\sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)\right)^2 \leqslant s(x;dA) \sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)^2$$

So, by our hypotheses,

$$s(x;dA) \geqslant \frac{\left(\sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)\right)^2}{\sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)^2} \gg \frac{x s_d(x;A)^2}{s_d(x;A)^2} = x.$$

That is, $\tilde{r}(x;dA) \gg 1$. We then apply Proposition 2.9. ■

The corollary follows naturally.

Corollary 2.11. *Let* $A \in \mathcal{S}$ *be a nondegenerate sequence. If for some integer* $d \geqslant 1$ *holds*

$$1 \ll r_d(n;A) \ll \tilde{r}_d(n;A),$$

and in addition $\tilde{r}_d(x;A) \asymp f(x)$ *for some non-decreasing real function* f*, then* $A \cup \{0\}$ *is an asymptotic basis.*

Proof. The condition $\tilde{r}_d(n;A) \gg 1$ is equivalent to $s(x;A) \gg x^{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 1/d$, as we previously discussed. Obviously, $r_d(n;A) \gg 1$ is as well a necessary condition to A be an asymptotic basis.

The remaining hypothesis, $r_d(n;A) \ll \tilde{r}_d(n;A)$, implies:

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} r_d(n;A)^2 \ll \sum_{n \leqslant x} \tilde{r}_d(n;A)^2 \asymp \sum_{n \leqslant x} f(n)^2 \ll x f(x)^2 \asymp x \tilde{r}_d(x;A)^2 = \frac{s_d(x;A)^2}{x}.$$

Therefore the remainder of the proof is reduced to the case of Theorem 2.10. ■

The way that M. B. Nathanson (see [10]) describes the proof that every number greater than or equal 2 is the sum of a bounded number of primes involves to prove that the sequence of primes satisfies the conditions of Corollary 2.11 for $d = 2$, using methods of sieve theory. Y. V. Linnik (see his book *Elementary methods in analytic number theory*) shows, in the solution of Waring's problem, that the sequences of perfect k-powers satisfies the conditions of the corollary as well. The direct usage of this corollary is a nice shortcut to these proofs, although not very effective, since the hard work is actually to show that these sequences satisfy the corollary's hypotheses.

2.4 Some limitations

From the previous results, two naive questions raise up naturally:

Question 1. Is $s(x;A)$ O-regularly varying for every $A\in\mathcal{S}$?

Question 2. Does every nondegenerate sequence $A\in\mathcal{S}$ with $s(x;A)\gg x^{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon>0$ form an asymptotic basis?

The answer to both questions is negative. In H. Halberstam and K. F. Roth's book (see [7]), a counterexample to Question 2 it is credited to A. Störh[†], in which is shown that, given $A\in\mathcal{S}$ with $s(x;A)=o(x)$, no asymptotic lower bound to $s(x;A)$ can by itself ensure that A is an asymptotic basis. We shall present a counterexample to Question 1.

Counterexample to 1. Let $C:=\{n^3:n\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\}$ be the sequence of perfect cubes. We take

$$A:=C\cup\left\{(2^{2^n})^3+k:0\leqslant k\leqslant(2^{2^n})^2,\ n\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}\right\}.$$

From $(n+1)^3-n^3>n^2$ for $n\geqslant 0$, we see that our sequence is obtained by adding n^2 successors of cubes of numbers of the form $(2^{2^k})^3$ to C. Hence,

$$\sum_{k\leqslant\log_2\log_2(\lfloor n^{1/3}\rfloor)-1}(2^{2^k})^2\leqslant s(n;A)-n^{1/3}\leqslant\sum_{k\leqslant\log_2\log_2(\lfloor n^{1/3}\rfloor)-1}(2^{2^k})^2+n^{2/3},$$

where equality is obtained on both sides infinitely many times, on the left when $n=(2^{2^k})^3$ for some $k\geqslant 0$ and on the right when $n=(2^{2^k})^3+(2^{2^k})^2$. Let the sequences $a_n:=(2^{2^n})^3$ and $b_n:=(2^{2^n})^3+(2^{2^n})^2$. Estimating the sum:

$$\sum_{k\leqslant\log_2\log_2(\lfloor n^{1/3}\rfloor)-1}(2^{2^k})^2\leqslant\left(2^{\frac{\log_2(\lfloor n^{1/3}\rfloor)}{2}}\right)^2\log_2\log_2(\lfloor n^{1/3}\rfloor)\ll n^{1/3}\log\log n.$$

Then follows:

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{s(b_n;A)}{b_n^{2/3}}=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{b_n^{1/3}+\sum\limits_{k\leqslant\log_2\log_2(\lfloor b_n^{1/3}\rfloor)-1}(2^k)^2+b_n^{2/3}}{b_n^{2/3}}>0$$

and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{s(a_n;A)}{a_n^{1/3}\log\log a_n}=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{a_n^{1/3}+\sum\limits_{k\leqslant\log_2\log_2(\lfloor a_n^{1/3}\rfloor)-1}(2^k)^2}{a_n^{1/3}\log\log a_n}<+\infty.$$

That means that holds $s(a_n;A)\ll a_n^{1/3}\log\log a_n$ and $s(b_n;A)\gg b_n^{2/3}$. As $2a_n>b_n$, we have

$$\frac{s(2a_n;A)}{s(a_n;A)}\gg\frac{s(b_n;A)}{s(a_n;A)}\gg\frac{b_n^{2/3}}{a_n^{1/3}\log\log a_n}\gg\frac{\left((2^{2^n})^3+(2^{2^n})^2\right)^{2/3}}{2^{2^n}\cdot n}\gg\frac{2^{2^n}}{n}\succ 1,$$

so $s(2x;A)\not\asymp s(x;A)$, and we conclude that $s(x;A)$ is neither O-regularly varying nor $\asymp f(x)$ for some O-regularly varying f. ■

[†] A. Stöhr, **Gelöste und ungelöste Fragen über Basen der natürlichen Zahlenreihe I**,' J. reine angew. Math. **194** pp40–65 §7, 1955

3 Probability measures on $\mathcal{S}$

In this section we shall equip $\mathcal{S}$ with a convenient probability measure relative to a certain sequence. In this probability space, *almost all* sequences will have a counting function asymptotic to a certain given function, and this will give us tools to prove existence theorems by probabilistic methods, like this (see [5]):

Theorem (Erdös-Tetali)**.** *For every integer $h \geqslant 2$, there exists an asymptotic h-basis B such that*

$$r_h(n; B) \asymp \log(n).$$

That is, in some sense, there is an *economic* or *thin* asymptotic h-basis, since there is not many ways to write a sufficiently large number as sum of h elements of B, and still it is an asymptotic h-basis.

Most of the techniques used in the original paper of P. Erdös and P. Tetali revolve around disjointness and independence, for *low correlation* plays a starring role in such probabilistic constructions and is commonly dealt with some kind of "exponential bounds and Borel-Cantelli's lemma" approach.

The main results are Corollaries 3.5, 3.9 and Corollary 3.15 along with Theorem 3.16. In our discussion about Erdös-Tetali, Conjecture 3.17 arises naturally.

3.1 Constructing $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$

We will state now a definition that follows from a construction. The performability of such construction is explained in chapter III of [7] with more details. In this section we will denote by $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$ a sequence chosen at random.

Definition 3.1. Given a real sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ satisfying $0 \leqslant \alpha_n \leqslant 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, we write $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ to denote the probability space $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ satisfying the following two properties:

- For every $n \geqslant 0$, the event $B^{(n)} := \{\omega \in \mathcal{S} : n \in \omega\}$ is measurable and $\mu(B^{(n)}) = \alpha_n$;
- The events $B^{(0)}, B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, \ldots$ are independent.

Thus, we may see $r(n;\omega)$ as Bernoulli trails, with $\Pr(r(n;\omega) = 1) = \alpha_n$. In this way, the $r(n;\omega)$ are doing the role of the characteristic functions of the events $B^{(n)}$, modeling an infinity coin flip bet, with some kind of special coins. Notice that the random variables $r(n;\omega)$ are independent as well.

We define $\mathcal{F}$ by the σ-algebra generated by the π-system generated by the events $B^{(0)}, B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, \ldots$. The elements of this π-system is often called *cylinder events*. We now state two lemmas that can be found in [6].

Lemma 3.2 (Kronecker's lemma)**.** *Let $(a_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ a real sequence such that $\sum_{n\geqslant 1} a_n$ converges. If $(m_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is a positive unbounded increasing real sequence, then*

$$\sum_{k\leqslant n} a_k m_k \prec m_n.$$

Lemma 3.3 (Kolmogorov's two-series theorem)**.** *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ a probability space and $(X_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ a sequence of independent discrete random variables. If both $\sum_{k\geqslant 1} \mathbb{E}(X_k)$ and $\sum_{k\geqslant 1} \operatorname{Var}(X_k)$ converges, then, with probability 1, $\sum_{k\geqslant 1} X_k$ converges.*

Using this we will be able to capture the idea behind the construction of the probability spaces $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ be a sequence of probabilities such that $\sum_{n\geqslant 0}\alpha_n$ diverges. Then, in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$, holds* a.s.

$$s(x;\omega)\sim \mathbb{E}(s(x;\omega)),$$

that is, with probability 1.

Proof. Firstly, notice that $\mathbb{E}(s(x;\omega))=\sum_{n\leqslant x}\alpha_n$. Now define, for every $n\geqslant n_0$, where n_0 is the least integer for such that $\alpha_{n_0}>0$,

$$X_n := \frac{r(n;\omega)-\alpha_n}{\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k}.$$

Routine calculations lead us to $\mathbb{E}(X_n)=0$ and $\mathrm{Var}(X_n)=\frac{\alpha_n-\alpha_n^2}{\left(\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k\right)^2}$. Notice that we applied a linear transformation to $r(n;\omega)$, so the X_n are still pairwise independent for $n\geqslant n_0$. Also,

$$\frac{\alpha_n-\alpha_n^2}{\left(\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k\right)^2}\leqslant \frac{\alpha_n}{\left(\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k\right)^2}\leqslant \frac{1}{\sum_{k\leqslant n-1}\alpha_k}-\frac{1}{\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k},$$

so we can give an upper bound to the sum $\sum_{n\geqslant n_0}\mathrm{Var}(X_n)$ and telescope it, showing that it converges, then by Lemma 3.3 we have that $\sum_{n\geqslant n_0}X_n$ converges with probability 1.

Now, noticing that $\left(\sum_{k\leqslant n}\alpha_k\right)_{n\geqslant 0}$ is an unbounded increasing sequence, we apply Lemma 3.2 to X_n in order to get that, with probability 1,

$$\sum_{k\leqslant x}\alpha_k \succ \sum_{k\leqslant x}\left(X_k\sum_{j\leqslant k}\alpha_j\right)=\sum_{k\leqslant x}(r(k;\omega)-\alpha_k)=s(x;\omega)-\sum_{k\leqslant x}\alpha_k,$$

that is equivalent to $s(x;\omega)\sim\sum_{k\leqslant x}\alpha_k$, as required. ■

Corollary 3.5. *Let f be an asymptotically defined C^1 positive function that diverges with f' being monotonic. If $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ is sequence of probabilities with $\alpha_n\sim f'(n)$, then, in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ holds* a.s.

$$s(x;\omega)\sim f(x),$$

that is, with probability 1. *Furthermore, if in addition f is* type-1, *then by the integral formula for s_d (Theorem 2.6) holds, for* almost all $\omega\in\mathcal{S}$,

$$s_d(x;\omega)\sim\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha}s_{d-1}(t;\omega)f'(x-t)dt,\quad \forall d\geqslant 2.$$

Proof. Using that f' is monotonic,

$$\mathbb{E}(s(x;\omega))=\sum_{n\leqslant x}\alpha_n\sim\sum_{\alpha<n\leqslant x}\alpha_n\sim\sum_{\alpha<n\leqslant x}f'(n)\sim\int_{\alpha}^{x}f'(t)dt\sim f(x).$$

As f diverges, so does $\sum_{n\geqslant 0}\alpha_n$, hence the claim follows from Theorem 3.4. ■

With this, we can to give a measure μ to $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ where *almost all* sequences $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$ with respect to μ satisfy, for example, $s(x;\omega) \sim x/\log x$, namely $(\mathcal{S}, (1/\log n)_{n\geqslant 3})$. Note that in this case we are only interested in the asymptotic behaviour of $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$, so we can also use, for example, the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ with $\alpha_n := 0$ when $n < e$ and $\alpha_n := 1/\log n$ otherwise. In other words, *almost all* sequences of this space are in some sense *prime-like*.

Remark 1. At this point, no interesting non-probabilistic results has been proven by our constructions. Although, Corollary 3.5 can be viewed as a fancy way to show that for every suitable *type*-1 f there is $A \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $s(x;A) \sim f(x)$.

Remark 2. Corollary 3.5 leads us to the thought that to use $f'(n)$ is the most natural way to construct spaces in order to study sequences with asymptotic density approachable by f. In fact, it makes us rethink our previous definition of $\tilde{r}(n,A)$, but that is not necessary since in the majority of interesting cases we actually have $f'(x) \asymp f(x)/x$. A precise statement of this may be found in N. H. Binham's et al. book (for instance, Theorem 1.7.2 and Proposition 2.10.3 of [2]).

3.2 Integral formula for $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$

We now focus on investigate how $r_d(n;\omega)$ works. As one could expect, it is in some sense easier to deal with this probabilistic version of r_d rather than with the non-probabilistic r_d. Our goal is to estimate $\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega))$ in convenient spaces $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$. We start with a technical lemma that will help us avoid some problems with correlation while estimating $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $A \in \mathcal{S}$, $d \geqslant 1$ an integer and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. Then, for all $k \geqslant 0$,*

$$r_d(n;A) \leqslant r_d(n;A\cup\{k\}) \leqslant r_d(n;A) + \binom{d}{\lfloor d/2\rfloor} \sum_{1\leqslant m<d} r_{d-m}(n-mk;A) + \mathbb{1}_{n/d}(k),$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{n/d}(k) = 1$ if $k = n/d$ and 0 otherwise.

Proof. The first side is obvious. For the second, we use the definition and follow a purely combinatorial approach:

$$\begin{aligned} r_d(n;A\cup\{k\}) &= \sum_{k_1+k_2+\ldots+k_d=n} r(k_1;A\cup\{k\})r(k_2;A\cup\{k\})\ldots r(k_d;A\cup\{k\}) \\ &= \sum_{k_1+k_2+\ldots+k_d=n} r(k_1;A)r(k_2;A)\ldots r(k_d;A) + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+\ldots+k_d=n \\ k\in\{k_1,\cdots,k_d\} \\ k_j\neq k \iff k_j\in A}} 1 \\ &= r_d(n;A) + \sum_{1\leqslant m<d} \binom{d}{m} r_{d-m}(n-mk;A) + \mathbb{1}_{n/d}(k) \end{aligned}$$

As $\binom{d}{\lfloor d/2\rfloor}$ bounds the binomial coefficient, we deduce the right side. ■

In the proof of the following proposition we will use 2^d instead of $\binom{d}{\lfloor d/2\rfloor}$, for in despite of being a worse bound it works anyway.

Proposition 3.7 (Summation formula for $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$)**.** *Let f be a* type-2 *function. If $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ is a sequence of probabilities with $\alpha_n \sim f'(n)$, then, in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ holds, for $d \geqslant 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) = \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))f'(n-k) + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Consider the following:

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k\leqslant n} r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega)\right) = \sum_{k\leqslant n} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega))$$

Given that the result is valid for $d = 2$ by independence, we apply induction on d. Now we have a little problem with independence since $r_{d-1}(k;\omega)$ and $r(n-k;\omega)$ are in general **not** independent for $d \geqslant 3$. However, since $r(n-k;\omega)$ is a Bernoulli trial, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega)) = \mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega))\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega) \mid r(n-k;\omega) = 1). \tag{3.2}$$

One can deduce from Lemma 3.6 applied for ω, $d-1$ and k that taking $n-k$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega))\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)) \\
&\leqslant \mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega))\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega) \mid r(n-k;\omega) = 1) \qquad (3.3)\\
&\leqslant \mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega))\left(\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)) + 2^{d-1}\sum_{1\leqslant l<d-1} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-l-1}(lk-(l-1)n;\omega)) + \mathbb{1}_{k/(d-1)}(n-k)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

At the moment, we want to estimate $\sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega))$. Taking the summation on the last part of the upper bound in the previous inequality, we use the induction hypothesis to get, for $d \geqslant 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\leqslant n}\left(2^{d-1}\sum_{1\leqslant l<d-1} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-l-1}(lk-(l-1)n;\omega)) + \mathbb{1}_{k/(d-1)}(n-k)\right) \\
&= 2^{d-1}\sum_{1\leqslant l<d-1}\sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-l-1}(lk-(l-1)n;\omega)) + \sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{1}_{(d-1)n/d}(k) \\
&\leqslant 2^{d-1}\sum_{1\leqslant l<d-1}\sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-l-1}(k;\omega)) + \sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{1}_{(d-1)n/d}(k) \\
&\ll \sum_{1\leqslant l<d-1}\sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-2}(k;\omega)) \ll \mathbb{E}(s_{d-2}(n;\omega)),
\end{aligned}$$

which lead us to conclude, by Corollary 3.5 and Theorem 2.2, that this term is $O\left(f(n)^{d-2}\right)$.

Thus, these bounds on $\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega) \mid r(n-k;\omega) = 1)$ along with f' being monotonic O-regularly varying allows us to deduce from (3.2) and (3.3), for $d \geqslant 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega)) &= \sum_{k<n/2}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))\mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega)) + \sum_{n/2\leqslant k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega)r(n-k;\omega)) \\
&= \sum_{k\leqslant n}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))\mathbb{E}(r(n-k;\omega)) + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, bounding the tails just like (2.2) and (2.3), we deduce for $d \geqslant 2$:

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) = \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha}\mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))f'(n-k) + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}).$$ ■

Theorem 3.8. *Under the same conditions of Proposition 3.7 holds, for $d \geqslant 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) \asymp f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}.$$

Proof. The result is valid for $d = 1$ by hypothesis, so we apply induction. Taking $d \geqslant 2$ and assuming the statement valid for $d-1$, by Theorem 3.7:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) &\asymp \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))f'(n-k)\\ &\asymp \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f(k)^{d-2}f'(k)f'(n-k)\end{aligned}$$

Now let us bound this sum. Firstly, given that f' is O-regularly varying, monotonic and bounded, when $d = 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f'(k)f'(n-k) &= \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n/2} f'(k)f'(n-k) + \sum_{n/2<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f'(k)f'(n-k)\\ &\ll f'(n/2)\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n/2} f'(k) + f'(n/2)\sum_{n/2<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f'(n-k)\\ &\ll f'(n/2)f(n/2) \asymp f(n)f'(n).\end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f(k)^{d-2}f'(k)f'(n-k) \ll f(n)^{d-2}\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f'(k)f'(n-k) \ll f'(n)f(n)^{d-1} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f(k)^{d-2}f'(k)f'(n-k) &\gg f'(n)\sum_{n/2<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f(k)^{d-2}f'(n-k)\\ &\gg f'(n)f(n/2)^{d-2}\sum_{n/2<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f'(n-k)\\ &\gg f'(n)f(n/2)^{d-1} \gg f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}. \end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

The statement then follows from (3.4) and (3.5). ■

Again, similar to the case of Theorem 2.6, one might expect to obtain, in view of the constants of (2.5),

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) \sim dC_{f,d}f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}, \tag{3.6}$$

that is a much sharper result. If f is C^2 *type*-2, then by Euler-Maclaurin summation

$$\sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} f(k)^{d-2}f'(k)f'(n-k) = \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} f(t)^{d-2}f'(t)f'(n-t)dt + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}),$$

so (3.6) depends whether or not (2.6) and

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty} \frac{\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} f(t)^{m-2}f'(t)f'(x-t)dt}{f'(x)f(x)^{m-1}} \tag{3.7}$$

exists for each $1 \leqslant m \leqslant d$. If the above converges to some $K > 0$, then, calling $c_{f,m}$ the limits from (2.6) and given that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dx}\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} f(x-t)^{m-1}f'(t)dt &= (m-1)\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} f(x-t)^{m-2}f'(x-t)f'(t)dt + f(\alpha)^{m-1}f'(x-\alpha)\\ &= (m-1)\int_{\alpha}^{x-\alpha} f(t)^{m-2}f'(t)f'(x-t)dt + f(\alpha)^{m-1}f'(x-\alpha)\\ &\sim K(m-1)f'(x)f(x)^{m-1},\end{aligned}$$

one can integrate both sides in order to get, assuming the convergence of (2.6), that $K = \frac{m}{m-1}c_{f,m}$, for the integral on the right side must be $c_{f,m}f(x)^m$. As $C_{f,d} = \prod_{k=1}^{d} c_{f,k}$, it would imply (3.6) immediately by a simple induction argument.

One can show, for example, that in $(\mathcal{S}, (\frac{1}{2}n^{-1/2})_{n\geqslant 1})$ holds $\mathbb{E}(r_2(n;\omega)) \sim \frac{\pi}{4}n^{1/2}$, or that in $(\mathcal{S}, (1/\log n)_{n\geqslant 3})$ holds $\mathbb{E}(r_2(n;\omega)) \sim n/(\log n)^2$. Again, however, I could not decide a general condition over f that ensures the convergence of both (2.6) and (3.7), and my suspicions revolve around regularly varying C^2 *type*-2 functions.

We conclude by presenting an integral formula for $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$ in certain spaces.

Corollary 3.9 (Integral formula for $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$)**.** *Let f be a C^2* type-2 *function. If $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ is a sequence of probabilities with $\alpha_n \sim f'(n)$, then, in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ holds, for $d \geqslant 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) = \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(s_{d-1}(t;\omega))f''(n-t)dt + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.7:

$$\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) = \sum_{\alpha<k\leqslant n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(r_{d-1}(k;\omega))f'(n-k) + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}).$$

Applying Abel's summation formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) &= [\mathbb{E}(s_{d-1}(t;\omega))f'(n-t)]_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} + \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(s_{d-1}(t;\omega))f''(n-t)dt + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2})\\ &= \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} \mathbb{E}(s_{d-1}(t;\omega))f''(n-t)dt + O(f'(n)f(n)^{d-2}).\end{aligned}$$ ■

3.3 f-regular asymptotic bases

The discussion succeeding Theorem 3.8 leads us to the following thought.

Definition 3.10 (f-regular asymptotic basis)**.** Let f be an asymptotically defined differentiable real-valued function. An asymptotic h-basis $B \in \mathcal{S}$ is said to be **f-regular** if, for every $d \geqslant h$, there are positive real constants M_d such that

$$r_d(n;B) \sim M_d f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}.$$

If instead of '$\sim$' we have only '$\asymp$', we call it **$\Theta(f)$-regular**.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $B \in \mathcal{S}$ and f a C^2* type-2 *function such that $s(x;B) \asymp f(x)$. If $r_h(n;B) \asymp f'(n)f(n)^{h-1}$ for some $h \geqslant 2$, then for every $d \geqslant h$ holds*

$$r_d(n;B) \asymp f'(n)f(n)^{d-1}.$$

Proof. Since the case $d = h$ holds by hypothesis, we apply induction for $d > h$. By the recursive formulas:

$$r_d(n; B) = \sum_{k \leqslant n} r(k; B) r_{d-1}(n-k; B) \asymp \sum_{\alpha < k \leqslant n-\alpha} r(k; B) f'(n-k) f(n-k)^{d-2}$$

Using Abel's summation formula:

$$\begin{aligned} r_d(n; B) &\asymp [s(t; B) f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2}]_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} - \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} s(t; B) \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2} \right) dt \\ &\asymp - \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} f(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2} \right) dt + o(f'(n) f(n)^{d-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let us bound the integral. Firstly, we have:

$$- \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} f(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2} \right) dt \ll f(n) \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(t) f(t)^{d-2} \right) dt \asymp f'(n) f(n)^d$$

And then, by O-regular variation:

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\alpha}^{n-\alpha} f(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2} \right) dt &\gg - \int_{n/2}^{n-\alpha} f(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(n-t) f(n-t)^{d-2} \right) dt \\ &\gg f(n/2) \int_{\alpha}^{n/2} \left(\frac{d}{dt} f'(t) f(t)^{d-2} \right) dt \\ &\gg f'(n/2) f(n/2)^{d-1} \asymp f'(n) f(n)^{d-1} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude by induction that for every $d \geqslant h$ holds

$$r_d(n; B) \asymp f'(n) f(n)^{d-1}. \qquad \blacksquare$$

To prove the existence of $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic bases we will use two largely known lemmas very recurrent in probabilistic methods in general. The first is an exponential bound taken from Appendix A of [1] credited to H. Chernoff, whereas the second is the Borel-Cantelli lemma, that can be found in chapter III of [7].

Lemma 3.12 (Chernoff bound). *Let $(X_k)_{k \geqslant 1}$ be mutually independent Bernoulli trials and $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k$. Then given $n \geqslant 1$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ holds*

$$\Pr\left(\left| \frac{S_n}{\mathbb{E}(S_n)} - 1 \right| > \varepsilon \right) < 2e^{-\delta \mathbb{E}(S_n)},$$

where $\delta = \min\{(1+\varepsilon)\log(1+\varepsilon) - \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2/2\}$.

Lemma 3.13 (Borel-Cantelli lemma). *Let $(X, \mathfrak{M}, \mu)$ be a measure space and $(E_n)_{n \geqslant 1}$ a sequence of elements of $\mathfrak{M}$. If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_n) < +\infty$, then*

$$\mu\left(\bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{n \geqslant m} E_n \right) = 0.$$

Recapturing our $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n \geqslant 0})$ setup, Chernoff bounds generally fails when we are dealing with $r_d(n, \omega)$ for $d \geqslant 3$, but for $d = 2$ it works great! In fact,

Theorem 3.14. *Let f a C^2 type-2 function. If $f'(x)f(x) \gg \log(x)$, then there is a constant $K \geqslant 1$ such that in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$, with $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ being a sequence of probabilities with $\alpha_n \sim Kf'(n)$, a.s. holds*

$$r_2(n;\omega) \asymp f'(n)f(n).$$

Proof. Firstly, consider

$$\rho_2(n,\omega) := \sum_{k<n/2} r(k,\omega)r(n-k,\omega).$$

Note that since $r(k,\omega)r(n-k,\omega)$ can be seen as a Bernoulli trial with expected value $\alpha_k\alpha_{n-k}$ in $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$, this is the sum of mutually independent Bernoulli trials, so we can apply Lemma 3.12. But first, notice that

$$r_2(n,\omega) = 2\rho_2(n,\omega) + r(n/2,\omega), \tag{3.8}$$

so by Theorem 3.8 we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\rho_2(n;\omega)) \asymp f'(n)f(n). \tag{3.9}$$

So for sufficiently large n we must have $\mathbb{E}(\rho_2(n;\omega)) > c_K \log(n)$, for some fixed constant $c_K > 0$ depending on K. With this in mind, Lemma 3.12 implies, as $n \to +\infty$, that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$:

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{\rho_2(n;\omega)}{\mathbb{E}(\rho_2(n;\omega))} - 1\right| > \varepsilon\right) \ll n^{-\delta c_K}, \tag{3.10}$$

for some $\delta > 0$ depending on ε.

To obtain $\rho_2(n;\omega) \asymp \mathbb{E}(\rho_2(n;\omega))$ a.s., it is sufficient to take some $\varepsilon < 1$ and $c_K > 0$ such that $\delta c_K > 1$, thus we can apply Borel-Cantelli's lemma and our statement follows from (3.8) and (3.9).

Taking $\varepsilon = .98$, Lemma 3.12 says that $\delta > .37$, so we just need $c_K \geqslant 3$. A quick look at Proposition 3.7 reveals that we may take $c_K = Kc_1$, for $K \geqslant 1$ can be easily drawn out of the sum in (3.1) and it does not affect the lower bound obtained in Theorem 3.8. Therefore, it is sufficient to take $K \geqslant 3/c_1$. ■

When $f'(x)f(x) \succ \log(x)$ we do not have to deal with careful choices of constants since the Chernoff's bound in (3.10) is, in this case, $O(n^2)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

This method, however, cannot be extended for the case $f'(x)f(x) = o(\log(x))$, that is basically when $f(x) = o(x^{1/2}\log(x)^{1/2})$. The same occurs when we try to extend this for $d \geqslant 3$, requiring a very elaborated argument that avoids the problems with the Chernoff bounds. A proof for $d = 3$ may also be found in chapter 8 of [1].

We have then the following corollary of Theorem 3.14.

Corollary 3.15. *For every C^2 type-2 function f with $f'(x)f(x) \gg \log(x)$ there exists a $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic 2-basis.*

Proof. Follows immediately by Theorem 3.14 and Proposition 3.11. ■

To ensure the existence of an asymptotic h-basis B such that $r_h(n;A) \asymp \log(n)$, P. Erdös and P. Tetali considered a particular space $(\mathcal{S}, (\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ with a sequence of probabilities $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ being such that

$$\alpha_n \sim Cn^{(1-h)/h}\log(n)^{1/h},$$

for a certain constant C depending on h. This is, however, $\asymp \frac{d}{dx}\left(x^{1/h}\log(x)^{1/h}\right)$, so with the aid of Proposition 3.11 we can restate Erdös-Tetali as follows:

Theorem 3.16 (adapted Erdös-Tetali)**.** *For every* $h \geqslant 2$*,*

$$\textit{there exists a } \Theta(x^{1/h}\log(x)^{1/h})\textit{-regular asymptotic } h\textit{-basis.}$$

Proof. Corollary from Erdös-Tetali and Proposition 3.11. ■

The methods used in [5] extends to general f. In fact, replacing the sequence of probabilities $(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ used in it, it is possible to show that for every C^2 *type*-2 function f with $f'(x)f(x)^{h-1} \gg \log(x)$ there exists a $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic h-basis, reinforcing the role of "minimality" perpetrated by $\log(x)$ in this framework.

At the moment, it seems that $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic bases not only exist, but are also reasonably treatable. But

Question. *Does there exists* f*-regular asymptotic bases? If so, for what kind of* f*?*

We firmly believe that considering functions such that (2.6) and (3.7) converge for every integer $m \geqslant 2$, some methods similar to those described in [5] with an improved version of Proposition 3.11 can ensure both the existence and "treatability" of such sequences. Unfortunately, a proof or counterexample for this will not be found in this paper.

Let us then digress a bit about a question raised by P. Erdös in 1956 in [4]. Actually, it became a conjecture that, just like Erdös-Turán, states what should be an asymptotic lower bound to the lim sup of r_h in asymptotic h-bases.

Erdös 1956 conjecture. *If* $A \in \mathcal{S}$ *is an asymptotic* h*-basis, then*

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{r_h(n;A)}{\log(n)} > 0.$$

This is way stronger than Erdös-Turán, as it says that $r_h(n;A)$ is not only unbounded above, but diverges in a sense that is never $o(\log(n))$. One may feel unlikely to believe it, after all, from where did $\log(n)$ popped out!?

It actually came from the technical limitations of the "exponential bounds and Borel-Cantelli's lemma" approach. Given $d \geqslant 2$, for any suitable slowly varying function L it is possible to construct a space where, in view Theorem 3.8, holds $\mathbb{E}(r_d(n;\omega)) \asymp L(x)$, e.g. $(\mathcal{S},(\alpha_n)_{n\geqslant 0})$ with $\alpha_n \sim Kn^{(1-d)/d}L(n)^{1/d}$ for some $K > 0$. The standard approach of the exponential bounds, however, simply fails when $L(x) = o(\log(x))$, suggesting that purely probabilistic methods may not suffice on their own to deal with such problems.

Other than that, it seems like there is no other immediate reason to believe on this statement. If only we could show that with some appropriate measure in $\mathcal{S}$ we can ensure r_d to be "close enough" to $\mathbb{E}(r_d)$ with probability > 0 we would be able to ensure the existence of asymptotic bases that contradict Erdös' conjecture.

Anyway, as showed by M. B. Nathanson in [11], representation functions that grow arbitrarily slowly exist in a broader way when we take $\mathbb{Z}$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. In fact, Nathanson showed that Erdös-Turán is false for $\mathbb{Z}$.

If representation functions could grow arbitrarily slowly, then Erdös-Turán conjecture would be a *maximal* statement about the lim sup of such functions. We finish this section with a version of Erdös' conjecture in terms of $\Theta(f)$-regular asymptotic bases.

Conjecture 3.17 (adapted Erdös 1956 conjecture)**.** *There are no* $\Theta(f)$*-regular asymptotic* h*-basis with*

$$f(x) = o\left(x^{1/h}\log(x)^{1/h}\right).$$

4 Remarks on Goldbach's conjecture

The discussion on the previous section may lead us to expect that if $\mathbb{P}$ is the set of primes, then for $d \geqslant 2$ we must have something like $r_d(n;\mathbb{P}) \approx n^{d-1}/\log(n)^d$. In fact, under the assumption of a weak version of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis, G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood showed in [8] that, for $d \geqslant 3$, when n runs through the natural numbers *with same parity than* d holds

$$r_d(n;\mathbb{P}) \sim \frac{2C_d}{(d-1)!}\frac{n^{d-1}}{\log(n)^d}\prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\geqslant 3}}\left(\frac{(p-1)^d+(-1)^d(p-1)}{(p-1)^d-(-1)^d}\right),$$

where C_d is a constant defined by

$$C_d := \prod_{p\geqslant 3}\left(1-\frac{(-1)^d}{(p-1)^d}\right).$$

The assumption was:

Weak GRH. *There is an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that for every Dirichlet character* χ *holds:*

$$\textit{If } L(s,\chi)=0, \textit{ then } \operatorname{Re}(s) \leqslant \frac{3}{4}-\varepsilon.$$

Actually this estimative has been rigorously proved by I. M. Vinogradov without any unproven assumption, although the case $d = 2$ remains (to this day!) unsolved, and not even the methods used by Hardy & Littlewood on $d \geqslant 3$ assuming the full power of GRH works in this case. Anyway, it motivates

Conjecture A (Hardy-Littlewood)**.** *As* n *runs through the even numbers,*

$$r_2(n;\mathbb{P}) \sim 2C_2\frac{n}{\log(n)^2}\prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\geqslant 3}}\left(\frac{p-1}{p-2}\right),$$

where C_2 *is the constant*

$$C_2 := \prod_{p\geqslant 3}\left(1-\frac{1}{(p-1)^2}\right).$$

Through an elementary combinatorial heuristic approach, we shall motivate a related conjecture about the behaviour of $r_2(n;\mathbb{P})$ that "miss" Hardy & Littlewood's conjecture only by a constant. Let us call it Conjecture B.

Conjecture B. *As* n *runs through the even numbers,*

$$r_2(n;\mathbb{P}) \sim \frac{n}{\varphi(n)}\frac{n}{\log(n)^2}.$$

Indeed, for $n \to +\infty$ through the even numbers we have

$$\frac{n}{\varphi(n)} = 2\prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\geqslant 3}}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) = 2\prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\geqslant 3}}\left(1-\frac{1}{(p-1)^2}\right)\prod_{\substack{p|n\\ p\geqslant 3}}\left(\frac{p-1}{p-2}\right).$$

Given that C_2 is constant, one can see that

$$\frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \asymp \prod_{\substack{p \mid n \\ p \geqslant 3}} \left(\frac{p-1}{p-2}\right).$$

Thus we can state a *Conjecture B'* that is slightly weaker but do not disagree with Hardy-Littlewood's conjecture.

Conjecture B'. *As n runs through the even numbers,*

$$r_2(n; \mathbb{P}) \asymp \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \frac{n}{\log(n)^2}.$$

Note that both three conjectures imply that for sufficiently large N, all even numbers greater than N are writable as sum of two primes. It does not imply Goldbach conjecture, but, anyway, "asymptotic Goldbach conjecture" is until the moment an open problem as well. So let us motivate Conjecture B.

4.1 Setup and motivation

For fixed $n > 1$, the first that can be said about primes p, q that sum up to $2n$ is that, WLOG, $p \leqslant n \leqslant q$. Clearly $p \mid 2n$ implies $p \mid 2n - p$, so we must have $\gcd(p, 2n) = 1$. Then we define some notation.

Definition 4.1 (Goldbach's function)**.** Given $n \geqslant 1$ let $g(n) := |\{p \leqslant n : 2n - p \in \mathbb{P}\}|$.

The notation on this section will be a bit different from the previous parts of the paper. Firstly, we will deal with $g(n)$ instead of $r_2(n; \mathbb{P})$. It can be easily "undone" noticing that $r_2(2n; \mathbb{P}) = 2g(n) - \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$, where $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}} \equiv r(\cdot, \mathbb{P})$.

Definition 4.2. For $n \geqslant 1$ we define:

- $A_n := \{1 < k < n : \gcd(k, 2n) = 1\}$,
- $B_n := \{n < k < 2n - 1 : \gcd(k, 2n) = 1\}$,

and also:

- $K(n) := |A_n|, \qquad P(n) := |A_n \cap \mathbb{P}|, \qquad Q(n) := |B_n \cap \mathbb{P}|.$

Observe that $k \in A_n$ if and only if $2n - k \in B_n$, so $|A_n| = |B_n|$. It also implies that if $2n - p \in \mathbb{P}$, then $p \in A_n \cap \mathbb{P}$ or $p \in B_n \cap \mathbb{P}$. We can thus write $K(n), P(n), Q(n)$ in terms of π, φ, ω, where ω is the distinc prime factor counting function:

$$\begin{aligned} K(n) &= \varphi(2n)/2 - 1 \\ P(n) &= \pi(n) - \omega(2n) \\ Q(n) &= \pi(2n-2) - \pi(n). \end{aligned}$$

With this we can deduce a nice result.

Proposition 4.3. *If $\pi(2n) - \omega(2n) > \varphi(2n)/2$, then $g(n) > 0$.*

Proof. Consider the following bijection:

$$\begin{aligned} f_n : A_n &\to B_n \\ k &\mapsto 2n - k \end{aligned}$$

If no $p \in A_n \cap \mathbb{P}$ is such that $f_n(p) \in B_n \cap \mathbb{P}$, then $f_n(A_n \cap \mathbb{P}) \subseteq B_n \backslash (B_n \cap \mathbb{P})$. It follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(A_n \cap \mathbb{P})| &\leqslant |B_n \backslash (B_n \cap \mathbb{P})| \\ P(n) &\leqslant K(n) - Q(n) \\ P(n) + Q(n) &\leqslant K(n) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the contrapositive, if the last inequality was reversed then there would be a $p \in A_n \cap \mathbb{P}$ such that $f_n(p) \in B_n \cap \mathbb{P}$, that is, $g(n) > 0$. Finally:

$$P(n) + Q(n) = \pi(2n-2) - \omega(2n) \geqslant \pi(2n) - \omega(2n) - 1$$

So, in order to have $P(n) + Q(n) > K(n)$, it is sufficient that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(2n) - \omega(2n) - 1 &> \frac{\varphi(2n)}{2} - 1 \\ \pi(2n) - \omega(2n) &> \frac{\varphi(2n)}{2}. \end{aligned} \qquad \blacksquare$$

Because of the growth order of the functions involved, the inequality on previous proposition holds only to a finite number of cases, that cease to occur when $2n$ is near 10^5. A deeper study on this perhaps would reveal weaker conditions to guarantee an even number to be sum of two primes, but that will not be our intention in this section.

4.2 The random variables $\tilde{g}(n)$

Rewriting g in terms of the bijection f_n used on the proof of Proposition 4.3:

$$\begin{aligned} g(n) = \sum_{p \leqslant n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(2n - p) &= \sum_{n \leqslant p < 2n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(2n - p) \\ &= \sum_{k \in B_n \cap \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(2n - k) + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n) \\ &= \sum_{k \in B_n \cap \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(f_n^{-1}(k)) + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n) \\ &= \sum_{k \in f_n^{-1}(B_n \cap \mathbb{P})} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(k) + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n) \end{aligned}$$

The difficult in to effectively understand g is exactly to count the primes on the pre-image of $B_n \cap \mathbb{P}$ by f_n. An attempt to avoid this problem can be to choose a subset of B_n with $Q(n)$ elements at random, that is:

$$\tilde{g}(n) := \sum_{\substack{k \in f_n^{-1}(J) \\ J \in \binom{B_n}{Q(n)}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(k),$$

where $\binom{B_n}{Q(n)} = \{X \subseteq B_n : |X| = Q(n)\}$.

Taking J at random, $\tilde{g}(n)$ becomes a random variable. From a population of $K(n)$ elements (the set A_n), $P(n)$ are primes (the set $A_n \cap \mathbb{P}$). Now we draw $Q(n)$ elements (the set $f_n^{-1}(J)$) and want to count how many primes we got. That is it! The r.v. $\tilde{g}(n)$ must follow a hypergeometric distribution[‡] with parameters $K(n), P(n), Q(n)$. Thus

$$\Pr(\tilde{g}(n) = k) = \frac{\binom{P(n)}{k}\binom{K(n)-P(n)}{Q(n)-k}}{\binom{K(n)}{Q(n)}},$$

defined for

$$\max\{0,\ P(n) + Q(n) - K(n)\} \leqslant k \leqslant \min\{P(n), Q(n)\},$$

with $\Pr(\tilde{g}(n) = k) = 0$ for other values of k. Note that when $P(n)+Q(n) > K(n)$ we have $\Pr(\tilde{g}(n) = 0) = 0$, that is another way do prove Proposition 4.3. We synthesize all this in the notation $\tilde{g}(n) \sim \mathrm{h}(K(n), P(n), Q(n))$, which reads *"$\tilde{g}(n)$ follows a hypergeometric distribution of parameters $K(n), P(n), Q(n)$"*.

Definition 4.4. For each $n \geqslant 1$, we define $\tilde{g}(n) \sim \mathrm{h}(K(n), P(n), Q(n))$.

The way we just defined it makes the $\tilde{g}(n)$ completely uncorrelated, although it is a little uncomfortable to assume this since $(A_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is not a pairwise disjoint sequence. The study of how $\tilde{g}(n)$ correlates with $\tilde{g}(m)$ for $n \neq m$ seems to be a fruitful way to obtain information about primes, but, again, it escapes our scope.

Anyway, it is interesting to remark that as we defined $\tilde{g}(n)$ in terms of a random subset J of A_n, one way to do this is to "keep" J as if it were a set of "real primes" and see how it affects $\tilde{g}(m)$. Note that it would not change the counting functions K, P, Q.

If you start this with $\tilde{g}(1)$ and then choose $\tilde{g}(n)$ subjected to all "chosen Js" used to stipulate $\tilde{g}(k)$ for $1 \leqslant k < n$, then you will always end up with the actual sequence of primes and actual values of $g(n) - \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$. This is just a straightforward remark on how primes are absolutely deterministic.

4.3 Asymptotic behaviour of $\tilde{g}(n)$

The following lemma can be easily deduced with known estimates of π, φ, ω, both presented in Hardy & Wright's number theory book (see chapter XVIII of [9]). We will omit the proof.

Lemma 4.5. *When $n \to +\infty$:*

(i) $P(n) \sim Q(n) \sim n/\log(n)$;

(ii) $n/\log\log(n) \ll K(n) \ll n$.

Also, $K(n) < n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$.

Let us explore now the hypergeometric distribution of $\tilde{g}(n)$. Following [12], we may calculate the expected value and variance for each $n \geqslant 1$:

- $\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n) = \dfrac{P(n)Q(n)}{K(n)}$;

[‡] To the puzzled reader, we suggest a quick look at M. Skala's paper [12].

- $\mathrm{Var}(\tilde{g}(n)) = \dfrac{P(n)Q(n)(K(n)-P(n))(K(n)-Q(n))}{K(n)^2(K(n)-1)}$.

Recording that $K(n) = \varphi(2n)/2 - 1$, it can be deduced from Lemma 4.5 that:

$$\mathrm{Var}(\tilde{g}(n)) \sim \mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n) \sim \frac{2n^2}{\varphi(2n)\log(n)^2}.$$

We now state a tail inequality to the hypergeometric distribution presented in [12] credited to W. Hoeffding and V. Chvátal. A proof may be found on Chvátal's original paper (see [3]).

Lemma 4.6 (Hypergeometric tail inequality)**.** *Let* $X \sim \mathrm{h}(N, M, n)$*. For all* $t \geqslant 0$ *holds*

$$\Pr(|X - \mathbb{E}(X)| \geqslant tn) \leqslant 2e^{-2t^2 n}.$$

The setup to deduce our conjecture is almost done, the only remaining thing is to set a convenient probability space to apply Borel-Cantelli's lemma (see Lemma 3.13). The naivest thing we can do is to simply take the product space with the product measure of each $\tilde{g}(n)$ for $n \geqslant 1$. And that is exactly what we are going to do!

In the canonical product space, $(\tilde{g}(n))_{n\geqslant 1}$ will be a sequence of pairwise independent r.v.s, exactly what we said that could be uncomfortable to some people. Well, this will only hurt a bit!

Theorem 4.7. *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *be the canonical product space of the discrete probability spaces of* $\tilde{g}(n)$ *for* $n \geqslant 1$*. In this space,* a.s. $\tilde{g}(n) \sim \mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)$ *as* $n \to +\infty$*.*

Proof. Equivalently to our statement, we will show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{m\geqslant 1}\bigcup_{n\geqslant m}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{g}(n)}{\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)} - 1\right| \geqslant \varepsilon\right)\right) = 0.$$

Our goal is to apply Borel-Cantelli lemma, so we start by applying Lemma 4.6:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{g}(n) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)| \geqslant tQ(n)\right) \leqslant 2e^{-2t^2 Q(n)}$$

Now dividing what is inside by $\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n) = P(n)Q(n)/K(n)$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{g}(n)}{\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)} - 1\right| \geqslant \frac{tK(n)}{P(n)}\right) \leqslant 2e^{-2t^2 Q(n)}$$

Using Lemma 4.5, we may use that $K(n) < n$ and, for sufficiently large n, that $P(n) > n/2\log(n)$ and $Q(n) > n/2\log(n)$. So:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{g}(n)}{\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)} - 1\right| \geqslant \frac{nt}{n/2\log(n)}\right) \ll e^{-nt^2/2\log(n)}$$

For each $n \geqslant 2$, let us change t for $1/2\log(n)^2$, in order to obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{g}(n)}{\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)} - 1\right| \geqslant \frac{1}{\log(n)}\right) \ll e^{-n/8\log(n)^5}$$

Observe that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} 1/\log n = 0$, and also clearly $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-n/8\log(n)^5} < +\infty$, thus for every $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\sum_{n\geqslant 1}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{g}(n)}{\mathbb{E}\tilde{g}(n)} - 1\right| \geqslant \varepsilon\right) < +\infty,$$

and our statement follows applying Borel-Cantelli lemma. ■

This lead us to expect that the "the real g" must behave like this, that is,

$$g(n) \sim \frac{2n^2}{\varphi(2n)\log(n)^2},$$

which translates exactly as the Conjecture B stated on the beginning of the section.

References

[**1**] N. Alon & J. H. Spencer, **The probabilistic method**, 2nd ed, New York: Wiley-Interscience, 2000.

[**2**] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie & J. L. Teugels, **Regular Variation**, Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[**3**] V. Chvátal, **The tail of the hypergeometric distibution**, Discrete Mathematics **25**, pp285–287, 1979.

[**4**] P. Erdös, **Problems and results in additive number theory**, Colloque sur le Theorie des Nombres, pp127-137, 1956.

[**5**] P. Erdös & P. Tetali, **Representations of Integers as the Sum of k Terms**, Random Structures and Algorithms **1**, pp245-261, 1990.

[**6**] W. Feller, **An introduction to probability theory and its applications 2**, Wiley, 1971.

[**7**] H. Halberstam & K. F. Roth, **Sequences**, Revised edition, Springer, 1983.

[**8**] G. H. Hardy & J. E. Littlewood, **Some Problems of 'Partitio Numerorum'; III: on the expression of a number as a sum of primes**, Acta Mathematica **44**, pp1-70, 1923.

[**9**] G. H. Hardy & E. M. Wright, **An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers**, 6th ed, Oxford University Press, 2008 [1938].

[**10**] M. B. Nathanson, **Additive Number Theory: The Classical Bases**, 2nd ed, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **164**, Springer, 1996.

[**11**] M. B. Nathanson, **Every function is the representation function of an additive basis for the integers**, Portugaliae Mathematica **62** Fasc. 1, pp55-72, 2005.

[**12**] M. Skala, **Hypergeometric tail inequalities: ending the insanity**, arXiv, http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.5939, 2013 [math.PR]